•	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
2	10-CR-294 (JNE/FLN)
3	
4	United States of America .
5	. Plaintiff, <b>SENTENCING</b>
6	vs. July 26, 2011
7	Theodore Stevie Varner . Courtroom 12W
8	. Defendant. Minneapolis, MN
9	
10	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOAN N. ERICKSEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12	APPEARANCES:
13	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
14	KAREN B. SCHOMMER
15	DEIDRE Y. AANSTAD Assistant United States Attorney
16	300 South Fourth Street Suite 600
17	Minneapolis, MN 55415
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19	REGGIE ALIGADA
20	Federal Public Defender 300 South Fourth Street
21	Suite 107 Minneapolis, MN 55415
22	Reported By: Maria Weinbeck, RMR, FCRR
23	Official Court Reporter 1005 U.S. Courthouse
24	300 South Fourth Street
	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415
25	Proceedings reported by stenotype, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

## PROCEEDINGS 1 2 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. 3 is United States versus Varner. Ms. Schommer, government 4 ready to proceed? 5 MS. SCHOMMER: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: And Mr. Aligada? 7 MR. ALIGADA: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Varner, you're ready to 8 9 proceed as well? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. Come on up with your lawyer. 12 Are there any changes or disagreements or anything that we 1.3 need to discuss in the presentence investigation report? 14 MR. ALIGADA: There's one remaining objection, but 15 because the parties don't object to the fact of armed career criminal designation, it's irrelevant. It doesn't need to be 16 17 resolved, and I've talked to the government, and we both 18 jointly agree on that position. 19 THE COURT: I don't know what you are -- are you 20 talking about the four points for the drugs? 21 MR. ALIGADA: That's correct, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. So for what it's worth, I am not 23 going to give him those four points, but it doesn't actually 24 make any difference because the total offense level is as

25

everybody seems to agree, a 33.

1 So that means that the imprisonment range under the 2 quidelines is 235 to 293 months. And the criminal history category, of course, is a 6. The supervised release range is 3 4 three years to five years. The fine range is \$17,500 to \$175,000. And then there of course has to be a \$100 special 5 6 assessment. 7 Now, there were a couple motions that were made in advance of sentencing, one by the government and one by the 8 9 defense. Let me first hear from Ms. Schommer, the government is withdrawing its motion for an upward departure from the 293 10 months; is that true? 11 12 MS. SCHOMMER: That's correct, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Aligada, there was 14 originally a motion for a new trial based on alleged juror 15 misconduct. That motion is withdrawn as well? 16 MR. ALIGADA: That's correct, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Schommer, anything from the government before I impose sentence? 18 19 MS. SCHOMMER: Yes, Your Honor, if I may stay here. THE COURT: That's good. 20 21 MS. SCHOMMER: While the United States has withdrawn its motion --22 23 THE COURT: Hold on a second. Mr. Varner, if you 24 want to listen to what the government has to say, I think 25 that's probably a good thing.

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: I just need to sit down for a few
 2
     minutes.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, since the government is
     talking anyway, why don't you go back and sit. Are you going
 4
     to be very brief or not?
 5
 6
               MS. SCHOMMER: Very brief, Your Honor. I mean if
 7
     the defendant wants to sit --
 8
               THE COURT: Okay.
 9
               MS. SCHOMMER: -- close to the podium. I am going
     to be brief, Your Honor. Although, the United States is
10
     withdrawing its motion for a upward departure, the criminal
11
12
     history nevertheless supports a quideline sentence which is
     from 235 to --
1.3
14
               THE COURT:
                           Hold on just a second. We'll get the
15
     defendant situated here. Well, he can go over there. There's
     already a low microphone for him, if he's going want to talk,
16
17
     Mr. Aligada. It's right there in front of you.
18
               MR. ALIGADA: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: But aren't you going to talk first?
20
               MR. ALIGADA: I will, but I can talk with these
21
     microphones.
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Can you hear me okay?
23
               THE COURT: Ms. Schommer, go ahead.
24
               MS. SCHOMMER: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
     defendant's criminal history is extensive. It's known to the
```

Court. It started when the defendant was approximately 20 years of age and has continued until today.

The defendant complains in his sentencing position paper that he has serious physical infirmities including a back injury, but he also states that that back injury occurred well before the conduct that brought us here today. It certainly didn't stop him from committing crime. It certainly didn't stop him from running from the police, darting in between houses, and jumping over fences trying to get way from them while he possessed a gun. And I would suggest that his physical impairment now is not a reason to vary downward from the guideline range.

The defendant is in the position that he's in because of his own criminal conduct. That criminal conduct got him 34 criminal history points. Almost three times the level that he needed just to get at the criminal history category 6.

Clearly, the sentences that he's received before have not deterred him from additional criminal conduct. It's not taught him any respect for the law. Certainly, hasn't protected the public from the defendant's continuing criminal action, and it hasn't provided just punishment.

So the United States would suggest that a sentence within the guideline range between 235 and 293 months is appropriate in this case and would ask for such a sentence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Aligada, again, your client seems to want to talk to you. Do you want to take a minute and consult with him before I hear from you? MR. ALIGADA: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. (Off the record discussion between defendant and defense counsel.) (In open court.) MR. ALIGADA: Thank you, Your Honor. May I proceed? Last week, Your Honor, I sent to the Court a letter from Raymond Varner, Mr. Varner's cousin. In addition, I sent some photographs. Included was this photograph, which was a color copy, but I hope that the Court can see that in Mr. Varner's hand in the photo is a scissors. THE COURT: I saw that. MR. ALIGADA: And what I didn't understand until this morning is that the gentleman who is second to the left is wearing a barber cape. And the occasion that was being celebrated at the time that this photograph was taken was Mr. Varner beginning a turn around of his life. He had chosen a profession that he believed deeply in, and that profession was cutting hair. He went to barber school. He graduated. And the Court will note that the men in this picture all have incredibly short hair, including the gentleman wearing the cape, and that's because Mr. Varner had just cut each of their hair.

THE COURT: Well, now what about the fellow with the purple hat? He's got some really long hair sticking out the back.

THE DEFENDANT: That's a girl.

MR. ALIGADA: That's Mr. Varner's daughter, Your Honor, who is a player on the Lynx team. He did tell me this morning that he had done some work on her dreadlocks, however. So she was included in the ability for Mr. Varner to show his talents.

This was an important day for Mr. Varner because there is no dispute that he has significant criminal history, but this was a point in his life where things had begun to turn around. I recognize that we're here for a different reason. But the summer of 2010 was a special time because Mr. Varner, as I said, had chosen a profession, was doing what he could to make a difference in people's lives, and that was cutting hair.

The presentence report has a very nice paragraph that the writer produced explaining what this new profession meant to Mr. Varner. And, frankly, the potential that he had to make a difference in people's lives.

I bring this fact to the Court's attention because as the Court knows Mr. Varner's history and background, but also his potential for the future are important. He stands convicted of a crime for which he has to be punished. There's

no question about that.

1.3

But the recidivist enhancement that comes with armed career criminal provides a significant floor for the Court of 180 months and a significant guideline range. It's my position that the starting point for — before any departure or variance is appropriately in the 235 to 293 range. And the basis for that is the balance between the significant criminal history with the potential that I've just talked about, and really the idea that Mr. Varner had internalized in his mind that a change should happen.

Now, from that starting point, I've made a motion for a downward departure on the basis of Mr. Varner's health condition. This is not a variety of health condition that is without documentary backup and medical justification. The presentence report has a lengthy paragraph that discusses the medical condition that Mr. Varner has.

But more importantly for purposes of the legal departure, it describes the effect on his life in a custodial setting. The Eighth Circuit law on 581.4, which I've detailed in the memorandum, explains these three conditions that have to be met before a departure is appropriate. And it's my position that all three of those conditions have been met.

In addition to the information that I've included in the sentencing memorandum itself, it's clear by what's happened in court today, that Mr. Varner has significant

physical impairment, the ability for him to sit and stand.

And I will tell the Court from my experience that this has been fairly consistent since I met him and had begun working with him. It has an impact on him in terms of what happens to him on a daily basis.

Lately, Mr. Varner has spent a significant amount of time in bed in the morning because of the pain. And when we look at the question under 5H1.4 of whether imprisonment would provide more than the normal hardship for him, there's no question that that is true because of this consistent pain that he experiences.

There is a second element that discusses both inconvenience and danger. Inconvenience is a light term to use for what Mr. Varner's daily tasks are like with a cane and a back brace being worn at all times.

This Court knows well that federal prisons are a place where other dangerous offenders are housed. And I credit the Bureau of Prisons in terms of placing people with similar physical impairments and abilities together. But I believe there will still be significant danger for him because of the lack of mobility.

So the final element then is whether there's a substantial present effect on his ability to function. The PSR bears that out. As I said, there's a strong paragraph there that explains it. And you can observe what's happening

to Mr. Varner today in terms of his ability to stand for long periods of time.

And it's for that reason, Your Honor, that truly from a justice point of view of what the right sentence is to punish him, even if this Court grants the criminal history as a factor to put him within the guidelines, 15 years of remaining in this kind of physical condition when it does not appear that surgery is going to happen. It does not appear that the strong kind of prescription medication that really blunts the pain is going to happen for fear of addiction. It means that he'll spend his sentence in pain and significant pain.

And so in looking at a term, 15 years is incredibly punitive. And I think that that factor in balancing everything else matters most in this case. And I ask for a sentence of 15 years, and I don't do it lightly because of this medical impairment.

As far as a designation, Your Honor, understanding what the Bureau of Prisons has to offer, a suitable facility for his medical treatment, I think, is the most important designation request. But after that, as close to Minnesota as possible. That leads me to ask for Rochester. I have no idea whether the bureau will put him there, but I think that it is an appropriate request. That is all that I have, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Just looking here to refresh my memory on the date of the back injury where he was robbed and thrown against --

MR. ALIGADA: February of 2010, Your Honor, is when that event occurred. And there was medical treatment after that, but the records that we have show medical treatment in August of 2010, prior to his arrest.

THE COURT: Okay. And then the arrest in this case was?

MR. ALIGADA: September of 2010.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Aligada, did you want to address the fact that although he appears not to be able to stand today at the trial, we heard testimony that he ran and jumped and sprinted.

MR. ALIGADA: Yes, and there was also testimony that he fell at least twice, maybe three times. I think that was a point of dispute, at the end of the chase. So certainly from, and I included this in the sentencing position, in terms of the physical issues, if the Court will remember there was also some testimony about whether he lost his shoes or not.

And so it suggests to me that in the present moment at that time, physical impairment was part of what happened in the chase that ultimately lead in him being arrested and apprehended. He did -- I mean an important part of the testimony was falling in the alley on his tailbone and coming

over a fence, and then falling again. And so it's my position that physical impairment was part of it then.

I don't remember much testimony about how fast he was running.

THE COURT: Well, the police officer testified that he was pretty much running, it seemed flat out, and your client jumped over a fence. I mean he jumped over a fence and then fell on his tailbone is my recollection of the testimony. So has anything happened? Has he had another injury between then and now? He can't sit, and he did not seem to be in this much distress during the trial.

MR. ALIGADA: I will tell the Court that -- I'm trying to be careful about privilege here -- but I will tell the Court that his back issues made it difficult for him to sit at trial for the extended periods of time that he did. And as you can see today, he's preferring to sit.

The question, of course, for this Court is in a penal institution, will he be able to sit or lie down all day?

I think the answer to that in general is no, unless they make special accommodations for him.

But the presentence report includes information that even sitting can be painful for him and create a numbing sensation and throbbing in his legs.

THE COURT: Now, he's been in custody for going on a year now?

MR. ALIGADA: That's correct.

1.3

THE COURT: And have there been any -- I don't have any medical reports from the jail where he's been indicating that they haven't been able to accommodate his medical situation. They've got him on a brace and some non-narcotic pain medications. You were just going to direct me to a particular paragraph?

MR. ALIGADA: That's right. I'm sorry, Your Honor, to interrupt. Page 20 of the PSR at paragraph 70 discusses physical condition. And I think it's important to note that in paragraph 70, there is a recommendation from a provider at Midwest Spine Institute that surgery is recommended. Let me make sure that I'm correct about this.

THE COURT: Well, I can't really understand it. It says, "noted anterior posterior spinal fusion with instrumentation and decompression at L4-5." I don't think that's a recommendation. I think that's a diagnosis.

MR. ALIGADA: That's correct. And then there's a Percocet prescription in paragraph 70. And then the next paragraph explains that at the jail, there was simply an authorization for a multivitamin and no medication. And I can proffer to the Court that this medical issue has been consistent. I'm holding —

THE COURT: It says here in paragraph 72 that he chose elective surgery consisting laminectomy and fusion

1 surgery with interbody fusion. 2 MR. ALIGADA: This is prior to his arrest. So in August of 2010 prior to his arrest, he had been seen at 3 4 Regions Hospital, and an elective surgery was chosen by him. The provider provided him the option, and he chose elective 5 6 surgery but that surgery did not happen prior to his arrest. 7 So that's kind of the moment in time of where he was physically before the arrest happened. 8 9 To be honest with you, Your Honor, I don't know whether the chase and falling on his tailbone exacerbated that 10 injury, but in my mind and the records back up that there were 11 12 serious back issues prior to that. 13 This, what I'm holding now, Your Honor, is his 14 medical file from Anoka. And this is, I don't know, about 100 15 pages. And I do have the medical referral from Midwest Spine Institute, which is my understanding did recommend the 16 17 surgery. 18 THE COURT: Do you have that? 19 MR. ALIGADA: I do. 20 THE COURT: If you wouldn't mind just giving me that 21 stack of medical information and I'll take a look at it. 22 MR. ALIGADA: I will do that, Your Honor. records to which I've just directed the Court are the records 23

referenced in PSR paragraph 70, in terms of the treatment that

he received from Midwest Spine Institute.

24

25

```
THE COURT: I can't find a date on that. That's
 1
 2
     from -- let's see, I can see all of these dates when it was
 3
     printed and received but.
               MR. ALIGADA: Right. Again, I believe that
 4
     corresponds with February 3, 2010. 2011, I'm sorry, in
 5
 6
     paragraph 70.
 7
               THE COURT: You think this surgery scheduling
     form -- Mr. Varner, I'm going to give you some time to talk to
 8
 9
     your lawyer now because I want to make sure that you --
               You keep talking while everybody else is talking and
10
     I want to make sure that you have an opportunity to listen to
11
12
     what is being said too, so go ahead and talk to your lawyer
13
     now, if you want to.
14
                (Off the record discussion between defense counsel
15
     and defendant.)
                (In open court.)
16
17
               MR. ALIGADA: Thank you for that time, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: So he saw Dr. Alper, it looks like
19
     pretty frequently when he was in Anoka County.
20
               MR. ALIGADA: I believe -- let me talk to
21
     Mr. Varner.
22
                (Off the record discussion between defendant and
     defense counsel.)
23
24
                (In open court.)
25
               MR. ALIGADA: It's my understanding that Dr. Alper
```

1.3

is the doctor at Anoka County, and he's retired now. One of the issues that arose, in terms of medical care, was that this condition is specialized enough that specialty care was important enough for him to receive outside of the facility.

So I believe that some of the records that the Court is seeing is the local doctor working with Anoka County commenting back and forth on future treatment options, based on what specialists said.

THE COURT: Well, all right. There's a lot here.

Well, here just last month, June, it looks like there was an observation. There's a record of your client expressing some sort of concern. It almost doesn't look complete about his medical situation and the institution saying that they observed him doing exercises. And he's saying he did push ups, which is his upper body, and then asking for a response.

And the response in the record says, "you've been observed riding exercise bike and doing pushups with your legs up on the sink elevated. If are you in so much pain, you should probably stop doing these exercises." Dated June 6, 2011, at 8 a.m. by some nurse.

MR. ALIGADA: One of the issues that has continually arisen is the question of what Mr. Varner should be doing to maintain back strength, given the fact that he has throbbing in the legs, and the ability to use his upper body when his legs aren't working.

1.3

Mr. Varner has chosen to do some exercises. We've gone around in circles about whether correctional folks observing him in that environment have the ability to comment on what his true medical condition is from the standpoint of ongoing pain.

The issue that I'm focusing on here is what will his experience in a custodial setting be like for the next so many years? And I think that the medical records bear out that he's in significant pain, has been for some time. And that in a correctional setting, the options for him are limited, as far as surgery goes. So that even if surgery were able to mend him, it's not an option that it appears is going to be there for him.

My experience is that in terms of narcotic treatment of pain, that's not something that correctional institutions do for a legitimate medical reason that their fear of addiction and what happens to medications inside a facility. Realistically means that Mr. Varner, I think, is limited to over the counter prescriptions for pain management.

The issue that I'm trying to just make known here is that his future is going to be one of low function in terms of physical ability, one of constant pain, and that makes it more punitive for him.

The doctors that specialize in his care and the doctors at Anoka County, I can tell you from months and months

of dealing with this, have gone back and forth about what the right treatment is. The marshals have gotten involved and have been very responsive to me in terms of trying to figure out what should happen.

But it's clear in the end that no will happen, and that no pain management more significant than over the counter drugs will be his future. I can't comment on the Bureau of Prisons, but I can't imagine that it's going to be much different.

And so my concern today in making this downward departure motion is I don't want to beat a dead horse here. But is the nature of what he will experience from a punitive point of view and how he will be -- how he will feel from the punishment point of view in custody. That is the issue.

THE COURT: Okay. There's no -- looking through your -- I'm not going to find a doctor's recommendation that he do those pushups with his legs elevated on a sink, am I?

MR. ALIGADA: I believe there was a recommendation of physical therapy, but I was able to talk with Glen Legus from the marshal, that he get an exercise book to assist him in that way.

THE COURT: I did see a reference here from the same person. It looked like the same person saying, "get this back book."

MR. ALIGADA: Right.

1 THE COURT: It's a back --2 MR. ALIGADA: Essentially, the position that Mr. Varner has been in is if I can't have surgery, and I can't 3 4 have pain management medication stronger than over the counter, then I have to have some other option here to make my 5 6 experience less painful and to be able to strengthen myself. 7 And so that's the nature of the exercises. What my concern is is that --8 9 THE COURT: We probably -- and then just one last --I interrupted you because I thought you were going to say the 10 same thing you've been saying which is about his experience in 11 12 prison, but if it was something different. 13 MR. ALIGADA: It's just this slight shade of 14 The medical records show a chronic back problem. difference. 15 THE COURT: No doubt. MR. ALIGADA: The back and forth inside of a 16 17 correctional institution from people who are concerned about 18 institutional safety but aren't licensed medical providers, at

MR. ALIGADA: The back and forth inside of a correctional institution from people who are concerned about institutional safety but aren't licensed medical providers, at least some of the observational stuff causes me concern, as far as diagnosing future treatment and future options and what he's cable of doing.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I've gone in circles about this for almost a year now. The question is whether to rely on the medical providers, which are affirmed in the presentence report, or to rely on observations in a correctional setting that may have

less to do with therapeutic options. That's my concern, and so I don't rely on them. I don't think the Court should as well.

Well, it seems clear that -- well, it seems clear, it's beyond doubt that he's got some issues with the L-4/5, and there's no question in my mind that that causes him pain, and that that is going to be something that will have to be addressed and managed.

MR. ALIGADA: I have a binder clip for that.

THE COURT: I'm going to give these back to you unless you feel some need to make them part of the record.

MR. ALIGADA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's also beyond question that the impact that the back problem has on his ability to be mobile seems to vary from time to time. To look at him today, he can hardly stand, and yet he is able to do these pushups with his legs elevated on the sink. He was able to run. He was able to jump.

I see from the pictures, that he's able to stand and hold children. And there's no brace there. He's able to squat, lean over, bending his back, and then -- so, I mean he's not immobilized, but it's beyond doubt that he's not in fact immobilized. He does experience pain, and that is backed up by the medical records. So that's how I see the state of the record with respect to the back injury.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So setting aside the back injury, is there any other area of comment that you want to make before I hear from your client, if he wants to talk? MR. ALIGADA: From a 3553 point of view, Your Honor, I would just reference Raymond Varner's letter. It does an excellent job of explaining the difficult upbringing that Mr. Varner had. And I think as Ray puts it, that as children, they learned rules of the game which undoubtedly are not the way that citizens should conduct their lives. But at age 8 and 9, that's how things were taught to them. So Mr. Varner is constantly struggling to recover from that life and to end where I started. The photograph of him with the scissors is that full circle of really trying to turn it around. And when Mr. Varner is finished with his sentence, that is something that he intends to return to. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Varner, this is your chance to speak in your own behalf, if you wish to do so, before I impose sentence. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. I really ain't -- I got a lot to say, but I really don't want to be rude, but. THE COURT: Be what? THE DEFENDANT: I have a lot I would like to say but I don't for you to feel like I'm being rude with you or with the Courts with the situation that took place with me with all

of this. 1 2 I don't have no reason to lie about anything. 3 man. You all seen my -- you looked at my record. I've got 4 all of these felony convictions and points because I took a plea bargain for me because I own up to my stuff. That's what 5 6 men do. Where I'm from, you accept what you do. If you do 7 it, you accept the consequences. This ain't something that I done. 8 9 So I lost a lot that I worked really hard for coming from where I came from, and now I'm sitting to where I have 10 really -- I don't have nothing, not even be able to really 11 12 move around or nothing, you know. And this is not fair to me 13 or my family, my kids. You know. 14 Like he said, my daughter plays ball for the Lynx. 15 I think I went to one game last year because I wasn't -- they say you can't fly. You just got out of prison. You can't 16 17 fly. They want you clear for a year or some stuff. Then I 18 guess the chance a year come around, I can move around and 19 spend more time with my kids. Now, I'm in here. I understand 20 that the police --21 MR. ALIGADA: May I have a moment, Your Honor? THE DEFENDANT: -- the marshals. 22 23 MR. ALIGADA: May I have a moment to speak with 24 Mr. Varner?

THE COURT: Sure.

25

```
1
               (Off the record discussion between the defendant and
 2
     the defense counsel.)
 3
               MR. ALIGADA:
                             Thank you.
                               That's it. That's all I'm going to
 4
               THE DEFENDANT:
 5
           I appreciate you taking time and cooperation and
 6
     patience with me during this situation that we've been went
 7
     through since I've been in your courtroom.
 8
               THE COURT: You don't have to say that. And if
 9
     there's more that you want to say, I'm not going anywhere.
                                                                 Ι
     guess you're not going anywhere, not to be --
10
               THE DEFENDANT: No, that's, that's good
11
12
     enough.
1.3
               THE COURT: Okay. It seems that you've been
14
     sometimes you've pled quilty, and sometimes you've gone to
15
     trial on some of these priors. And the points add up to what
     they add up to. But you were done, right, Mr. Varner? You've
16
17
     said everything you've wanted to say?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I had to say something else
19
     but I forgot though.
20
               MR. ALIGADA: It's up to you.
21
               THE DEFENDANT: I can't remember, man. Just one
22
     question because it's been puzzling me because I've been doing
     some research on myself with my case that I'm in here for.
23
24
     asked my lawyer, but I was asking can I know if get it in
25
     writing or something, but he really doesn't really say.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
But I was wondering how far do you go back on the
statutes for like career criminals, because I read in this,
"Busted By The Fed" books that they only go back 15 years.
But from my understanding from my lawyer, they can go back as
far as they want to.
          THE COURT: There's an actual book called, "Busted
By The Fed?"
          THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
          THE COURT: Is it good? Should I read it?
          THE DEFENDANT: I think it kind of lightened me up
on a little stuff with what's going on with me right now. But
one part it says, "see career criminal for the sentencing
thing." And back there, it says they can't go past 15 years.
So I asked my lawyer, and he really is saying the same thing,
but so now I'm asking you. And that's basically really the
most important question that I would like to ask and say
today.
          THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Aligada, do you know what
he's talking about?
          MR. ALIGADA: I do, Your Honor. Armed career
criminal is predicate offenses. And Mr. Varner and I have
discussed how far back predicate offenses can go to count.
And the distinction between career offender designation --
          THE COURT: For the guidelines.
         MR. ALIGADA: -- for the quideline purposes, and for
```

```
1
     the career quideline enhancement versus the statutory
 2
     component of ACCA and the age of convictions. It's my
 3
     understanding from researching the law and prior cases, that
 4
     ACCA predicates have no time bar going backward. 924E does
     not provide a limitation on how far back you can go.
 5
 6
               Because one of Mr. Varner's early convictions that
 7
     is a predicate is old enough that it would age out for
     purposes of something like criminal history points or career,
 8
 9
     but not for ACCA. And so I've explained that to him, and he
     wants to check a second source with the Court.
10
                                                      I respect
11
     that.
12
               THE COURT: When did he get out after that? After
13
     that oldest?
14
               MR. ALIGADA: I believe it was a 1989 conviction.
15
     Paragraph 27 of the presentence report includes a notation
     that an aggravated robbery offense from Ramsey County was a
16
17
     predicate under 4B1.4. And, frankly, under 924E as well. He
18
     was discharged from custody on 1/9 of 1994.
19
               THE COURT: So '94, 2004, 2009, so that would be
20
     just outside the 15 years.
21
               MR. ALIGADA: Correct.
               THE COURT: So that's his concern.
22
23
               MR. ALIGADA: It's a legitimate question.
24
               THE COURT: Yes, that is a legitimate question.
25
     I've got get ahold of this book. There's probably all kinds
```

```
1
     of stuff in there that would explain why people make some of
 2
     the arguments that they do. Who wrote that book? Is that a
 3
     reliable person who wrote that book?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: I think his name is something
     Williams or something. Cooper Williams?
 5
 6
               THE COURT: The name doesn't mean anything to me,
 7
     but is he a lawyer or is he an inmate or what the heck is he?
 8
     I suppose he could be both.
 9
               THE DEFENDANT: He was a paralegal or something, and
     got that when he was in the feds, and then he wrote the book.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
11
12
               MR. ALIGADA: Just to make a factual clarification
13
     that Mr. Varner just brought to my attention. The Court
14
     referenced earlier standing, sitting, squatting.
15
     photograph was taken after the point when he was robbed.
16
     the rest of the photographs, the one where he is squatting.
17
     It's hard to tell in this photograph and a couple of others
18
     where he is standing was prior to the robbery. Just for
19
     factual clarification.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what they give you
21
     for books in there, and I am not qualified to give you legal
22
     advice.
23
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes, ma'am.
24
               THE COURT:
                           I am paid to make legal decisions, but I
25
     am absolutely not allowed to give people legal advice.
```

1 your lawyer is here. 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 3 THE COURT: And I'm going to just point out some 4 parts of the statute and parts of the guidelines in the application that might be helpful to you in your discussions 5 6 with him. But we're clear on that I can't give you any legal 7 advice, right? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. 9 THE COURT: So the statute that makes you an armed 10 career criminal, this is this 924E that your lawyer was talking about. 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: I don't think that was in the book 13 as to what it was. 14 THE COURT: Yeah, you know what? That book sounds 15 like not really an authoritative source to me. People can write whatever they want so, I don't know. But anyway, 16 17 whatever that book is, it does not have the force of law. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. 19 THE COURT: This is where the -- this book here, 20 this light green one is the Criminal Code. It's the 2011 21 printing of the Criminal Code. But it's everywhere. 22 So this is 924E. And it talks about the prior 23 offenses of violent felonies or serious drug offenses. And 24 the only reference to 15 years there is the mandatory minimum 25 sentence of 15 years. So you've got no -- there is no age

```
1
     limit that is spelled out in this section.
 2
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes, ma'am.
 3
               THE COURT: So that's probably what your lawyer was
 4
     talking about for that. So that's right there on page 725.
 5
               Then there are the guidelines. And this career
 6
     offender quideline is section 4B1.2. And the most current
 7
     version of the guidelines is the bright green book, but this
     part hasn't changed.
 8
 9
               And 4B1.2 talks about what a crime of violence
10
     means, and that includes crimes that have the attempted use,
     threatened use of physical force against another or burglary
11
12
     or controlled substances, all of which are defined.
13
               Now, there's nothing in there about a time limit.
     But under normal circumstances, there is a time limit to how
14
15
     old a criminal conviction can be when you're going to
     calculate somebody's criminal history.
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
18
               THE COURT: But -- I just saw this application note
19
     that said that that doesn't count for this. Now, I can't find
20
     it again.
21
               MS. SCHOMMER: I believe it's the application note
     to 4B1.4.
22
23
               THE COURT: There we are. I just had it.
24
               Mr. Aligada, would you show him, we've got 4B1.4,
     and go to the application note 1, so the top of page 396
25
```

1 there. And I'm going to be in the first paragraph there, in 2 the middle of the first paragraph. Do you see where it says, "It is to be noted that --" 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. "It is to be noted that the definitions 5 THE COURT: 6 of violent felony and serious drug offense in 924E2 are not 7 identical to the definitions of crime of violence and controlled substance offense used in the career offender." 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 10 THE COURT: But then look at next. It says, "nor are the time periods for the counting of prior sentences under 11 12 4A1.2, which is definitions and instructions for computing 13 criminal history applicable to the determination of whether a 14 defendant is subject to an enhanced sentence under 924E." 15 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. THE COURT: So there is a time limit for criminal 16 17 history, but then there are special provisions for the career 18 offender and armed career criminal. So you do your own 19 research, and you talk to your own lawyer. But that's my 20 basis for not excluding that '94 conviction, so I say that by 21 way of explanation for my decision and not by way of legal 22 advice to you. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Well, now I have to determine what to do 25 in terms of a sentence. Now, I know that you had a very

difficult and cruel childhood. I know that following that, you committed an awful lot of crimes. And if the way that you were raised gets you back out on the street faster, the criminal history here shows that that's not safe for the community. Because for whatever reason, and it seems likely that it is related to the fact that you had such a cruel upbringing, what that has done to you has made you commit all of these crimes.

Are you going to turn over a new leaf? I think that's a good possibility, and having a skill and being so persistent in it. And I liked reading that you actually sometimes would pay the bus fare, the transportation fare for people to come and let you work on their hair.

So that's a, you know, it's a possibility. But what you did with your upbringing so far is not something that weighs in your favor. It weighs in favor of making sure that we protect the public from, you know, what happened. Yes, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I learned from all this, right? I know I didn't get to be the person that I am overnight. And so it took me a long time to become the person that I am right now. So to keep moving forward, that's where I'm going to keep my mind set at. That's why I do here, because if you feel good. If you look good, you feel good. You want to do great.

THE COURT: Yep, I saw that. That's the part of the joy that you get out of the hair cutting.

THE DEFENDANT: So that's something that I never received when I was growing up. So now since I found something that makes me happy, that keeps me happy, I share it with other people. That was the whole thing about my life turn around. Whatever happened before then, I came somewhere else, and now I found something different.

THE COURT: Yep, yep, and that happens to people.

And for a lot of people, it sticks. You know, some people have a conversion, and they turn their life around, and it sticks for a while, and then they back slide. But sometimes it really does, especially if somebody is well into adulthood, as you are, it really can stick. You just don't know for sure whether it's going to or not, but it can.

And your cousin wrote this very nice letter for you, and talked about how you don't want to perpetuate the fatherless situation that you had. But I think you've got a bunch of kids, don't you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yep.

THE COURT: You've got six children. Determining what the overall range, you know, kind of what the range is of appropriate sentences isn't something that judges do completely one-on-one each time, and pick a number out of thin air.

We've got a Guideline Commission that looks at people's history, what's likely to happen, what are good indications of what might happen in the future. They do whatever they all they do, and they come out with these sentencing guidelines.

And the sentencing guidelines for you are guidelines that are -- there's nothing about them that's not appropriate to your situation. It takes account of your criminal history. It takes account of the fact that you had this gun. It takes account of the, you know, you're kind of on paper situation.

So is there anything that should give you a higher sentence? The government has withdrawn its request that you get a sentence higher than 293 months. I don't think I'd give you a sentence of higher than 293 months any way even if they asked for it, because that would be, I just think that would be more than you really need. Because you are 41. I'm thinking that you're 41. Maybe you're not 41 anymore.

MR. ALIGADA: 42, Your Honor.

THE COURT: 42 now. Anyway, I just think that's too much. The only listed factor that gives me pause about giving you a sentence below the guidelines, and that would require my deciding that the bottom of the guidelines would be more than was necessary for you, is this physical issue that we spent so much time talking about.

And I can't tell really what you are physically able

to do, and what you're physically not able to do. We do have people in the institutions who literally can't walk, and they can't do physical exercise, whether they're in pain or not.

Now, the BOP, the Bureau of Prisons, is going to be in a better position to help you with your back problem than the county jail was. So the fact that the county jail dealt with your problem in the way that they did, not that that was bad or inadequate, but not necessarily something that you would want to keep doing for the next many years. So the Bureau of Prisons will be in a better position to do that.

And your medical situation isn't so far outside the norm that that would be a reason to give you a sentence that is not within the range that otherwise would be appropriate for you.

And so something in the neighborhood of about, you know, probably 250 months is what I would be thinking. But I want to get you out in the shortest period of time consistent with the appropriate punishment and all of the factors that go into those not only the guidelines but also looking at the seriousness of the offense and so on.

So it seems to me that going to the very bottom of the guideline range is something that I can do, and that that's not going to be more time than you earned yourself by the commission of this crime.

I recognize that's a long time. And there's an

1.3

argument to be made that all sentences, in a way, in this country are too long. But that's not a philosophical debate to be had for today.

So I'm going to sentence you to the bottom of the guideline range which is to say 235 months. And then you are going to be on supervised release for a period of five years after you get out. And the conditions will all be explained and read to you separately.

But they are that you have to report to the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services Office in the district where you are released within 72 hours of release from custody.

You may not commit any crimes: Federal, state, or local.

You may not illegally possess a controlled substance. You have to refrain from my unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment, and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court.

And let me just pause on that, and what I'm going to say here for a moment is not part of the conditions of supervised release. But I know when you were caught, and I didn't give you those four points, but you had a prescription for OxyContin or some kind of a strong medication.

THE DEFENDANT: Percocet.

THE COURT: Was it Percocet? Because what you had

on you was --

THE DEFENDANT: It's Percocet. I don't know what -it's Percocet. That's the only thing that the hospital
prescribed for me and gave to me.

THE COURT: Okay. But there were two different kinds of drugs in that container that you had on you when the police caught you back in September of 2010. So what I'm saying is that I've got this condition here about not illegally possessing a controlled substance, because you'll probably have, maybe you'll have surgery, and the pain will go away.

But if you have a prescription, you can't be carrying something that's similar to that prescription or you could be in violation of this condition of supervised release. So that's just kind of an aside on that.

Then continuing on with the conditions: You may not possess a firearm. No surprise there. No firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or other dangerous weapon. And you have to cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. I know that kind of doesn't make sense, but that's a requirement for basically all people who are convicted of a federal felony.

You have to abide by the standard conditions of supervised release that have been adopted by the Court including the following special conditions:

You have to participate in a program for substance abuse as approved by the probation officer. And that program may include testing and inpatient or outpatient treatment, counseling, or a support group. I'm thinking should I make you pay for that pursuant to the Court's program? And I'm going to say no. I'm not going to make you pay on the co-payment plan.

If you're not employed at a regular lawful occupation as deemed appropriate by the probation officer, you may be required to perform up to 20 hours of community service per week until you are employed and to participate in training, counseling, daily job searches or other employment related activities, as directed by the probation officer.

And then the final condition is that you are to submit your person, residence, office, vehicle or an area under your control to a search conducted by a U.S. probation officer or a supervised designee at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner, based on reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a supervision violation. And you are to warn other residents or third parties that the premises and areas under your control may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

So those are the conditions of supervision. As you know, I do have to impose a special assessment, and that is a \$100 special assessment, because that is the single count of

conviction.

I'll make some recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons, but before I do that, I want to make sure that I don't forget to let you know that any appeal would have to be noted within 14 days of today's date. If you cannot afford a lawyer on appeal, then you have one appointed to represent you at no cost.

I will recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that you be placed in a medical facility, at least initially for evaluation, and that you at all times during your incarceration be placed in a facility that is able to accommodate your back problem. I will specifically recommend the Rochester Institution in Minnesota.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: And the reason for that is that it's going to be close to your family, and you'll be able to maintain those connections, and that will help you for when you get out. It will also help them.

And it is also an institution that we know for a fact is going to be able to take care of your problems. There are at least one other federal medical institution that would be very, very supreme in being able to take care of your medical problem, but they're not to put you someplace where your medical needs won't be met.

Now, Ms. Schommer, there's a forfeiture provision,

```
right?
 1
               MS. SCHOMMER: There is, Your Honor. And I believe
 2
     I have to go back and look through the file, but I believe
 3
 4
     there is a preliminary order entered by the Court for that
     issue.
 5
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. And that's made final.
 7
               Mr. Aligada, is there anything else?
               MR. ALIGADA: If I could just consult with
 8
 9
     Mr. Varner for a second.
               THE COURT: Sure.
10
               (Off the record discussion between defendant and
11
12
     defense counsel.)
               MS. SCHOMMER: Your Honor, that preliminary
13
     forfeiture was filed on March 21, 2007.
14
15
               MR. ALIGADA: Nothing further, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. This is unrelated to
16
17
     Mr. Varner, but this massacre in Norway is on everybody's
18
     mind, and the maximum term of imprisonment in Norway, did you
19
     see is what, 20 years? 21 years?
20
               MR. ALIGADA: I didn't realize it was that low.
21
               THE COURT: So I think they have to get out in 17.
22
     Now, that I base on another non-authoritative legal source
23
     which is the radio. But we're not living in Norway.
24
               Well, that's everything. And, Mr. Varner, I know
25
     that you're not a bad person. But, you know, there's the
```

```
1
     crime, and there's the run up to the crime, and there's the
 2
     punishment. So I hope, and I have some confidence that you
 3
     are going to take it from here and you're going to be okay.
     But that's about it. That's about all we can do here. So we
 4
 5
     are in recess. Thank you.
 6
                (End of proceedings.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
                                  -000-
15
                I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
16
     from the record of proceedings in the above matter.
17
18
                                       Maria Weinbeck, RMR, FCRR
                                       Official Court Reporter
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```